

Individual and situational factors on workplace deviance psychology essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Workplace deviance has emerged as a major area of attention among human resource management and organizational behavior researchers (Bennett & Robinson, 2000, 2003; Griffin, O’Leary-Kelly & Collins). It is regularly performed in the workplace by a spectrum of employees ranging from blue collar employees, in both profit and non-profit organisation to white collar employees (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997).

In the perspective of Bennett and Robinson’s (2003), organizational deviance research contends a broader conceptualization of deviance which has occurred over the last ten years and an agreement on a definition has been difficult (Kidwell et al, 2005). It has spawned a variety of concepts and related definitions. For example, in Robinson and Bennett (1995), they defined workplace deviance as “ voluntary behavior of organizational members that violates significant organizational norms, and in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization and/or its members” (p. 556), and this definition has been adopted by other organizational research too such as Lee & Allen, 2002; Martinko, Gundlach and Douglas, 2002; and Sackett, 2002; Mount, Ilies and Johnson, 2006). Other researchers studied workplace deviance also use different distinct terminology such as retaliation (Skarlicki and Foldger, 1997), aggression (Douglas and Martinko, 2001; Fox & Spector, 1999; Neuman & Baron, 1997; O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996), revenge (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997), counterproductive behavior (Spector et al, 2005 and Sackett, 2002), antisocial behaviour (Giacolone & Greenberg 1997), dysfunctional behaviour and organizational misbehaviour (Vardi & Weitz, 2003).

Conceptually, workplace deviance is generally used to describe specific incidences of deviant behaviour in the workplace; therefore, the actions of individual employees serve as the basic unit of analysis (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). For this research the term workplace deviance by Robinson and Bennet (1995) will be used because it appears as one of the popular terms among researchers nowadays in this area. This includes local researcher for example Faridahwati (2003), Samsuddin and Rahman (2006) and Abdul Rahman (2008) who used this terminology.

Behaviors labeled deviant include unsafe work practices, drug abuse, stealing, dishonesty, volitional absenteeism, alcohol abuse, destruction of an organization's property (Griffin & O'Leary-Kelly, 2004), employee theft, withholding effort, violence, insubordination, sabotage, whistle-blowing, poor attendance, misuse of information, alcohol use and abuse, gambling, inappropriate internet use, littering (Mount, Ilies and Johnson, 2006) and harassment (Jixia Yang, 2008). In addition, with technology advancement and internet in the workplaces, browsing the web and checking personal emails are some of the diversity of workplace deviance acts (Nguyen, 2008).

Scholars have estimated that up to 75 percent (Harper, 1990), 85 percent (Harris and Ogbonna, 2002), and 95 percent (Slora, 1991) of employees routinely behave in a manner that can be described as deviance (cited in Harris and Ogbonna, 2006). Over the past decade, there has been an increase in attention to workplace deviance including violence, stealing, dishonesty, volitional absenteeism, drug and alcohol abuse many of which have been addressed in this special issue.

In Malaysia, the evidence of workplace deviance had begin to soar. KPMG Fraud Survey 2004 (Ngui, 2005) shows 83% of Malaysian public and private limited companies have experienced fraud which is also a form of workplace deviance. This is an increase of 33% from 2002 survey. Another survey by Pricewaterhouse Coopers Global Economic Crime Survey 2005 (Pricewaterhouse Coopers, 2006) reveals that 23% out of 100 Malaysian large companies surveyed have been subjected to fraud, and 70% of the cases reported was committed by employees (Zauwiyah and Mariati, 2008). Other evidence in Malaysia from the public media involve dishonesty and poor work attitude cases (New Strait Times, 2005), fraudulence, (Utusan Malaysia, 2004), underperformed and lazy (Star, October 2009) and the issue of fake medical certificate which these behaviors are labeled under forms of workplace deviance (Utusan Malaysia, 2003 cited from Abdul Rahman and Aizat, 2008). Other forms of deviance including corruption (New Straits Times, 2009) which is also a growing problem in Malaysia that highly involves employees in the public sector. For example base on a research done by Global Corruption Barometer which was announced by the Transparency International indicates that corruption percentage is high among employees in the public sectors (Berita Harian, June 2009).

Deviance act was also reported to the police and 27 disciplinary cases involving the public sector were reported by the Public Service Department (Abdul Rahman, 2008). In the Malaysian Current Law journal from 2000 until 2005 also reported a review of dismissal cases from the Malaysian Industrial Relations Department (Abdul Rahman, 2008). Samsuddin and Rahman (2006) also had highlighted the presence of workplace deviance in Malaysia.

Substance abuse for example also becomes a significant problem among public and private organizations in Malaysia. The National Drug Agency under the Malaysian Ministry of Internal Affairs registered a total of 250, 045 drug addicts in government and private sectors between January 1995 and February 2005 (Abdul Rahman, 2008). Other forms of deviance behavior including sabotage, threatening a pay cut, antagonising and showing disrespect of an employee's religious belief was also reported to the Labour Department (Faridahwati, 2004).

Whether the deviance is explicit or subconscious, it has negative consequences for the entity and affiliates. It affect organizational performance, safety and health of the employees (Kidwell and Kochanowski, 2005) and enormous costs associated with such behavior (Peterson, 2002). For example, nearly 95 percent of all companies in United States reported some deviance-related experience within their respective organizations (Henle et al., 2005) and the estimated impact of widespread workplace deviance has also been reported to be \$50 billion annually on the United States economy (Henle et al., 2005b). It is continue to soar out of control with nearly 95 percent of all companies reporting some deviance-related experience within their respective organizations (Case, 2000; Henle et al., 2005). Infact, employee theft and fraud is the fastest growing type of crime in the United States (Coffin, 2003)

Researchers have addressed the consequences of deviant behaviours in some detail. It is reported that workplace deviance gives a financial impact on the organizations and victims of workplace deviance are more likely to suffer from stress-related problems and show a relatively decreased

<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

productivity, lost work time and a relatively high turnover rate (Henle et al., 2005). The impact of workplace deviance can also be translated into turnover, lower productivity, employee morale, higher rates of absenteeism and turnover (Hoel, Einarsen, and Cooper, 2003; Keashly and Jagatic, 2003).

Therefore, given the growing prevalence of detrimental behaviors and the associated costs, it is beneficial to organizations and researchers to determine which variables contribute to such behavior, or identify potential factors that can predict the occurrence of various types of workplace deviance. Thus, there is great incentive, financial and otherwise, for organizations to prevent and discourage any negative workplace deviance within their walls. For these reasons, it is a great interest in understanding the antecedents of workplace deviance (Hogan and Hogan, 1989; Robinson and Greenberg, 1998; Henle, 2005; Mount 2006).

Base on the findings of past empirical research it shows that certain factors are vulnerable to deviant behaviors by employees such as job stressors (e. g., Fox et al, 2001), organizational frustration, (e. g., Spector, 1975), lack of control, over the work environment (e. g., Bennett, 1998), weak sanctions for rule violations (e. g., Hollinger and Cjiark, 1983), and organizational changes such as downsizing (e. g. Baron and Neuman, 1996). Some researchers had suggested that situational or organizational factors might be responsible for workplace deviance. Appelbaum et al. (2005) suggested that operational environment rather than individual personality characteristics is a good predictor of employees engaging in negative deviant workplace behavior.

This is opined by Henle (2005) that employees will commit deviant behavior in the organization depending on the situational environment in workplace
<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

regardless of their individual characteristics. However, Martinko (2002) suggested that individual difference variables is an important antecedent to workplace deviance because of the influence these individual differences are likely to have on attribution process. Previous research also has demonstrated that there are meaningful linkages between employees' individual characteristics and deviant behavior at work (e. g., Bennett&Robinson, 2003; Dalal, 2005; Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Salgado, 2002). However, Robinson and Greenberg (1998) point out that no clear picture emerges of a ' deviant personality type' and that personality traits seem to only account for a small percentage of the variance in predicting deviant behaviour (Browing, 2008).

Previous empirical research however did demonstrated that certain organizational factors also make companies more vulnerable to deviant behaviors by employees such as job stressors (e. g.. Fox et al, 2001), organizational frustration (e. g., Spector, 1975), lack of control over the work environment (e. g., Bennett, 1998), weak sanctions for rule violations (e. g., Hollinger and C; iark, 1983), and organizational changes such as downsizing (e. g. Baron and Neuman, 1996). Thus, base on this perspective, only indicates that deviant acts at work depending on the work environment regardless of their individual characteristics. Base on various researcher's perspective, there has been a controversial either individual characteristics or situational environment of the organization contributes to workplace deviance. In fact, there are also other researchers that suggested that various antecedents of workplace deviance from situational and individual difference. There are findings indicated that there are meaningful linkage

between personality characteristics and workplace deviance (e. g., Bennett and Robinson, 2003; Dalal, 2005; Douglas and Martinko, 2001; Salgado, 2002). This issue had been continue to be controversial and there had been little disagreement on the antecedent correlated to workplace deviance and consensus regarding which situational and individual differences correlated to workplace deviance. However, Colbert et al. (2004); Henle (2005) suggested that future research should identify both situation and person-based explanations of workplace deviance so that organizations could predict and ultimately, minimize the occurrence of workplace deviance. Even, more than a decade, apparently still very few studies have assessed both personal and organizational correlates (actual or self-reported) workplace deviance (Lefkowitz, 2009).

In Malaysia itself, studies on workplace deviance had been done previously by Shamsudin (2003), Faridahwati (2004), Razali (2005), Radzi and Din (2005), Sien (2006) and Abdul Rahman (2008). Various studies had been done using various units of analysis, for example, studies on workplace deviance done by Faridahwati (2004), Samsuddin (2003) and Sien use hotel employees as sample, Radzi and Din (2005) in a high technology multinational companies in the northern region, Razali (2005) focus on production workers in Penang and Abdul Rahman (2008) use production employees in manufacturing companies in various states in Malaysia. Base on this comparison, the existing local studies however fall short using public sector employees as unit of analysis.

2.0 Problem Statement

There is a growing problem of workplace deviance in the workplace that should not be ignored. Evidence from newspapers and other public media indicates various forms of workplace deviance exists in Malaysia such cases of dishonesty, poor work attitudes, fraudulence, and the issue of fake medical certificate (Abdul Rahman, 2008).

A number of regional Labour Department in Malaysia also had indicated that at least twenty to 30 cases in a month have been reported by employees and employers. Findings from Faridahwati (2003) revealed that saying hurtful things and making fun of someone at work stands out to be common forms of deviance act in workplace. In addition, the acts of deviance behavior at workplace had been documented increase in the number of reported incidents in workplace (Faridahwati, 2004). For example, corruption (Utusan online, October, 2009), theft, sabotage, harassment, cursed someone at work and publicly being embarrassed at workplace (Kosmo, October 2009), putting little effort at work (Utusan, August 2009), taking breaks during office hours which had become a culture among public sector employees (Arkib, 2008). All these behaviors are various forms of deviant behavior that had been reported by published media in public sectors.

Apparently, there are proofs of problems rooted in the poor performance among the public sector employees (Johari et al., 2009). This is supported by Siddique (2006), who claimed that public service agencies in Malaysia has long been criticized for its inflexibility, ineffective accountability, and poor performance among the officials. The bleak picture is evident when the

Malaysian Public Service has recorded 58 percent increase in formal
<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

complaints from the public (Siddique, 2006). In 2005, a total of 2, 707 complaints were received with regard to the public service poor performance, such as delays in service provision, unfair actions/decisions of the administrators, abuse of power, misconduct of the officials, and failure to enforce rules which all these are forms of deviant behaviors..

Added to this, the chief secretary of the Malaysian government, Tan Sri Mohd Sidek Hassan (2009) mentioned that the number of disciplinary cases against civil servants is on the rise. For example, there were 3, 383 such cases last year compared with 2, 159 in year 2007. Such form of deviant cases being reported are absenteeism, tardiness and sexual harassment. This is also opined by Abdul Rahman (2008) that disciplinary cases involving employees in the public sector had been highly reported. Absenteeism which also a form of workplace deviance had become a significant issue where there are cases of employees in public sectors did not turn up for work for almost three months without the knowledge of their supervisors and employers (Ministry of Human Resource, 2009). A report from January till September 2009 indicated that 129 public employees in Selangor were absent without reason or permission and 49% of the 129 public sector employees are from the support staff level (Bernama, 13 September, 2009). This was also supported by Cuepeccs Secretary, Ahmad Shah (2009) that most of them are in the category of supporting staff and is station outside the office. It also had been reported that absenteeism had been the four highest principal of offense cases which 7, 688 cases or 55 percent, followed by code of conduct and prohibition case, court cases and abuse or dangerous drug ownership (Utusan, June 2007).

Apart from the above, there has been an increase of 36.2% offense cases from public sector employees at various levels in year 2009 and 3,383 offense cases are committed compared to 2,159 cases in year 2007 (Tan Sri Mohd Sidek Hassan, Utusan dated October, 2009). Added to this, rules violation cases involve officers from the public service were reported to be increasing each year and as many as 2,955 in year 2006 compared to 1,943 at 2002 (Utusan, June 2008).

Vardi and Weitz (2004) stated that there are two major costs that come with workplace deviance, financial costs (e.g., destruction of organizational property, violation of laws, codes and regulations, etc.) and social costs (e.g., destructive political behaviors, harassment, and sustained suboptimal performance) (Griffin & O'Leary-Kelly, 2004). Thus, the pervasiveness of workplace deviance in public sector made it an important area to study.

Apart from the above, despite the increasing forms of workplace deviance reported in the public sector, there had been little studies or no attention to investigate workplace deviance in the perspective of public sector employees. In fact, workplace deviance had been received less attention among organizational scholars (Vardi and Weist, 2004; Abdul Rahim and Abdul Rahman, 2008).

3.0 Research Objectives

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the workplace deviance literature by adopting an interaction approach to empirically examine how both person- and situation-based variables interact to explain workplace deviance. The research objectives are as follows:

<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

- i) To identify typical forms of workplace deviance that exists in the public sector.
- ii) To investigate the determinants of workplace deviance that exists in the public sector.
- iii) To measure workplace deviance behavior in the public sector.
- iv) To determine whether individual variables (gender, negative affectivity, trait anger) influence workplace deviance in the public sector.
- v) To determine whether situational variables (job satisfaction, work group norms and organizational justice) influence workplace deviance in the public sectors.

4. 0 Significance contribution

This research makes contributions to both the theory and practice of management. Although scholars have recognized that deviance can be socially constructed, there has been a dearth of research that has specifically addressed this issue especially in the perspective of public sector employees.

Further to this, the purpose of this study is to contribute to the workplace deviance literature by adopting an interactional approach to empirically examine how both individual-and situation-based variables interact to explain workplace deviance.

On the implication, it benefits the superiors and managers. This study will contribute to a better understanding on deviant behaviors in the workplace

and contributed to the literature examining complex antecedents of workplace deviance. Furthermore, there is paucity for empirical study of workplace deviance especially in the context of public sector in Malaysia. Also, looking at the perspective of academic level, the result of this study will give more insight in the contribution and development of knowledge in the areas of human resource management and public administration concerning workplace deviance. It is also expected that the result from this proposed study will assist policy makers and practitioners to reduce the occurrences of workplace deviance issues related to organizational and individual factors. By understanding, the factors that influence workplace deviance, the government would also in a better position to plan and implement complementary and an integrated of public administration policies and practices to enhance the effectiveness of the employees in the public sector thus reduce the existence of workplace deviance.

The result of the study is also expected to assist government sectors to use the information from the study to implement training and development related to this issue. It will also contribute to all fields which in turn enhance the theoretical and academic integration of several branches (organization behavior and human resource management) and their mother field of public administration. Finally, the most ultimate objective is to reduce workplace deviance which contributes tangible and intangible costs to the victims and organization.

5. 0 Scope of study

This study is an explanatory in nature and adopts a cross-sectional design.

This study will targeted the support staff as sample. Support staff was
<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

chosen as it had been reported in the media that 10, 438 civil servants had been given disciplinary action from year 2003 till 2006 and 92 percent are from the support staff (Utusan, June 2007). Moreover, it has been suggested that those who have the lower status may be the most prone to exhibiting deviant behavior (e. g., Gilligan, 1996; Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982).

Employees from the Royal Malaysian Custom department will be chosen as sample as this department interact and liaise widely with various customers.

The study will fill the gap in terms of providing research findings that integrate the respondent's perception on situation variables (job satisfaction, workgroup norms and organizational justice) and individual variables (Gender, trait anger and negative affectivity) which all were conceptualize as independent variables. The focus of this study is to determine the individual and situational factors of workplace deviance in a public organization.

6. 0 Operational Definition:

Workplace Deviance: Voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both. This definition includes non serious (e. g. tardiness) as well as more serious types of workpalce deviance (e. g. theft of cash and harassment) (Robinson and Bennet, 1995).

Trait Anger: Trait anger is described as a disposition to experience state anger overtime and context overtime (Speilberger, 1996).

Negative affectivity: Negative affectivity reflects the extent to which individuals experience distressing emotions such as hostility, fear, and anxiety (Watson & Clark, 1984).

<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

Job satisfaction: Job satisfaction reveals the degree to which an employee is content with their job as a whole and encompasses multiple aspects of one's job ranging from the work itself, the quality of interpersonal relationships, compensation and career advancement opportunities (Bruck, Allen & Spector, 2002).

Work Group Norms: Group Norms are informal rules that group adopts to regulate and regularize group member's behavior (Fieldman, 1984).

Organizational injustice: Three types of fairness perceptions: distributive, procedural, and interactional injustice. Judgements concerning distributive revolve around the employee's evaluations of outcome fairness, that is, whether the individual has received a fair share of rewards given his or her relative contribution to a societal exchange (Adam, 1965). Distributive injustice typically refers to fairness evaluations regarding work outcomes such as pay, benefits, promotions, and so on. Procedural injustice includes judgments about the processes and procedures used to make decisions and to determine one's outcome (Greenberg, 1990, Lind & Tyler, 1988).

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

2. 0 Introduction

A large body of literature on the topics of workplace deviance and its antecedents provides will be reviewed in this chapter. An extensive search process was conducted by utilizing numerous database. This chapter will provide contemporary literature regarding workplace deviance as discussed in the previous chapter.

<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

2. 1 Workplace deviance

Researchers have given these behaviors many different names including workplace deviance (Bennett and Robinson, 2003), counterproductive behavior (Mangione and Quinn, 1975), and antisocial behavior (Giacolone and Greenberg, 1997). In essence, behavior is deemed deviant when an "organization's customs, policies, or internal regulations are violated by an individual or a group that may jeopardize the well-being of the organization or its citizens" (Robinson and Bennett, 1995).

This proposed study will use the definition of workplace deviance by Robinson and Bennett (1995) as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both." Organizational norms in this definition assume a managerial orientation about expectations of employee behaviors without excluding adoption of this perspective by other employees. This definition also focuses on violations of norms that apply across a broad spectrum of employees, rather than violations of norms around specific duties. Employee deviance, then, consists of acts that violate norms encouraging respect for organizational property and norms that encourage respect for other individuals.

Workplace deviance ranges from milder forms, such as rudeness and tardiness, to more extreme forms, such as theft, workplace deviance is considered part of the performance domain (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Sackett, 2002; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000). Behaviors that have been identified as deviant in previous research include subtle expressions of rebellion (e. g., gossiping, taking unapproved breaks), as well as more

<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

aggressive actions (e. g., theft, verbal abuse; Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Keashly, Trott, and MacLean (1994), in their study of abusive behavior in the workplace which is also a form of workplace deviance found that, found that all participants had experienced at least one incident of nonsexual, nonphysical abusive behavior. Relatedly, 32% of participants in Bjorkqvist, Osterman, and Hjelt-Back's (1994) study of harassment (also one of the forms of deviance) at work reported that they had observed others being mistreated.

Workplace deviance can be divided further into two subcategories (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). The first category, referred to as interpersonal deviance, consists of acts that inflict harm upon individuals (e. g., verbal harassment, assault, spreading rumors). Organizational deviance is defined as acts directed against the company or its systems (e. g., sabotaging equipment, theft, wasting resources).

The prevalence and costs of deviance in the workplace make its study imperative (Robinson and Lawrence, 2007). Psychological reactions to workplace deviance include feelings of depression and anxiety (Bjorkqvist et al., 1994). Psychosocial problems (Kaukiainen, Salmivalli, Bjorkqvist, Osterman, Lahtinen, Kostamo, & Lagerspetz, 2001); emotional exhaustion (O'Brien & Vandello, 2005; Tepper, 2000); life dissatisfaction (Tepper, 2000); and decrements in emotional well-being (LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002; Schat & Kelloway, 2000), self-esteem, and self-confidence (Price Spratlen, 1995) are other psychological strains. Work-related psychological reactions are job dissatisfaction, work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict (Tepper, 2000), and decrements. in job-related affect (Schat & Kelloway, 2003), normative

<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

commitment, and affective commitment (Tepper, 2000). Physical reactions include physical symptoms (Kaukiainen et al., 2001) and decrements in psychosomatic well-being (LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002; Schat & Kelloway, 2003).

Due to the impact, workplace deviance has increasingly received researchers' attention, in part because of the alarming statistics indicating its pervasiveness in the workplace. The financial and non financial costs associated with workplace deviance warrant attention from both researchers and practitioners. Much research attention has been given to the damaging effects of workplace deviance within organizations. However, as yet, little research has been conducted to try to understand whether and how the presence of workplace deviance is associated with a deterioration in public administration.

Research regarding workplace deviance often investigates personality (e. g., Douglas and Martinko, 2001; Salgado, 2002) or situational (e. g. Greenhcrgr, 1990; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997) predictors while neglecting the interaction between the personality and situational variables. Consistent with other research areas and calls to examine the joint influences of situational and individual variables on deviant workplace behavior (Sackett & DeVore, 2001), some researchers have begun to empirically investigate interactionist hypotheses in the deviance literature (e. g., Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick; 2004, Henle, 2005). Colbert et al. (2004) noted that future research should examine the joint relationship of perceptions of the work situation and personality with both organizational and interpersonal deviance. As suggested by Mickaulay (2001) that understanding the independent effects

<https://assignbuster.com/individual-and-situational-factors-on-workplace-deviance-psychology-essay/>

of situational and individual variables may lead to more effective control of workplace deviance. Therefore, this proposed research will look into the situation and personality as well as the interaction between the two as empirical research on this dynamic between the individual and situation has been limited (Mickaulay, 2001).

2. 2 Individual and situational factors of workplace deviance

Workplace deviance is influenced by situational as well as individual factors (Colbert et al., 2004; Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Marcus & Schuler, 2004).

Individual factors may have a direct effect on workplace deviance. For example, Douglas and Martinko found that a combination of individual difference measures (e. g., trait anger, attribution style, and self-control) accounted for 62% of variance in self-reported workplace aggression which is also a form of workplace deviance (Tang et al., 2008). Other individual characteristics are related to workplace deviance (e. g., conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability; Colbert et al., 2004).

Workplace deviance is also influenced by situational as well as individual factors (Colbert et al., 2004; Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Individual factors may have a direct effect on workplace deviance. . For example, Skarlicki et al. (1999) found that negative affectivity interacted with perceptions of distributive and interactional justice in the prediction of retaliatory behaviors. When situational factors investigate deviant behaviors, individual factors may amplify this effect (as in the case of trait anger; Hepworth & Towler, 2004) (as in the case of self-control; Brown et al., 2005).

Base on the above perspective on individual and situational variables towards workplace deviance, this study contributed to the workplace deviance literature by examining the importance of situation- and person-based explanations in addition to their interactions. Although many have advocated for an interactional approach to studying deviant work behaviors, few studies have done so (Henle, 2005).

The organizational and social psychology literature demonstrate that individual differences constitute an important explanation for workplace deviance. However, it appears that workplace deviance cannot be attributed to individual traits alone. Langton et al. (2006) also assert that no single factor or theory that can account for each and every occurrence. For example, even an employee working in the same company and having the same demographic characteristics, are not both necessarily going to commit workplace deviants act. As such, Langton (2006) opined that there must be internal traits that predispose a worker to workplace deviance. It is also more likely that deviant behavior may be best predicted based on a combination of individual variables and the situational nature of the workplace situation (Peterson, 2002). For this research, individual variables (gender, trait anger and self control) and situational variables (job satisfaction, stress (work stress and general life stress), work group norms and perceive justice) will be used as independent variables for this study.

2. 3 Individual variables

2. 3. 1 Gender

Various researchers had indicated that male tend to be more deviant behavior at work (Baron et al., 1999), absenteeism (Johns, 1997), theft (Hollinger and Clark, 1983), substance abuse (Hollinger, 1988), and vandalism (DeMore et al., 1988). Researchers also